

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/803,911	YAGI, SHIGERU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Usman Khan	2622	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Usman Khan. (3) Stephen Catlin.  
 (2) Tuan Ho. (4) Olaolu Adekunle.

Date of Interview: 05 December 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 8 and 18.

Identification of prior art discussed: lida et al. (US patent No. 7,230,642) and Bilhorn (US patent No. 5,173,748).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant representative pointed out that the prior art fails to teach a judging means for judging shooting conditions of an object based on the comparison result of the comparing means in independent claims 8 and 18 for which the examiner agrees. Also, The applicant representative pointed out that the secondary reference of Bilhorn is not combinable with the primary reference for which the examiner agrees. The examiner will update the search and if new art is found a second Non-final will be issued otherwise the case is in condition for allowance. Also, the applicant representative mentioned that they might be willing to drop the traverse for the restriction dependeng on the updated search by the examiner.